R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 702 CG 001 911

THE TRAINING AND UTILIZATION OF CHILD BEHAVIOR CONSULTANTS IN THE SCHOOLS. FINAL REPORT.

BOARD OF COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
REPORT NUMBER ESEA-PROJ-NO-1298/2083
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.64 89P.

DESCRIPTORS- *PROGRAM EVALUATION, QUESTIONNAIRES, CASE STUDIES (EDUCATION), *CHILD DEVELOPMENT SPECIALISTS, *CONSULTATION PROGRAMS, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT,

THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT IS TO EVALUATE THE OBJECTIVES AND PRE-OPERATIONAL TRAINING OF A PROGRAM DESIGNED TO PROVIDE CHILD BEHAVIOR CONSULTANTS (CBCS) FOR SCHOOLS. THE EVALUATION IS BASED ON QUESTIONNAIRE DATA, CASE STUDIES, AND INTERVIEWS WITH TEACHERS AND STUDENTS. WHETHER THERE WERE ACTUAL PERSONALITY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STUDENTS WHO WERE REFERRED TO A CBC AND THOSE WHO WERE NOT, AND WHETHER THE ROLES OF CBCS BECAME WHAT THEY HAD ORIGINALLY ANTICIPATED ARE ALSO DISCUSSED. CHAPTER I ANALYZES THE ORIGINAL OBJECTIVES OF ONE PROGRAM AND THE PRE-OPERATIONAL TRAINING FOR IMPLEMENTATION. A REFINED ANALYSIS OF THE ROLES PLAYED BY CBCS IS CONTAINED IN CHAPTER II. EXTENSIVE INTERVIEWS WITH TEACHERS AND STUDENTS FORM THE BASIS OF CHAPTER III. CHAPTER IV DESCRIBES A STUDY WHICH DETERMINED IF PERSONALITY DIFFERENCES WERE EXTANT BETWEEN STUDENTS WHO WERE AND WERE NOT REFERRED TO THE CBC. CHAPTER V PROVIDES A STATEMENT OF THE FUNCTIONS THE CBCS FELT THEY PROVIDED WITHIN THE SCHOOL SETTING. IN CHAPTER VI, THE EXTENT TO WHICH PROGRAM OBJECTIVES WERE IMPLEMENTED, THE INVESTIGATOR'S CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARE DISCUSSED. (IM)

ED019702

Board of Cooperative Educational Services
First Supervisory District of Erie County
99 Aero Drive
Duffalo, New York 14225
716 634-6800

FINAL REPORT: NARRATIVE

"The Training and Utilization of Child Behavior Consultants in the Schools"

Project funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, Public Law 89-10. Project numbers 1298 and 2083.

Roger Reger, Director
SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES
4295 South Harris Hill Road
Buffalo, New York 14221
716 634-5620

CG 001 911

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Acknowledgements	4
Chapter I	5
Bibliography	11
Chapter II	12
Chapter III	41
Chapter IV	62
Appendix	69
Chapter V	72
Appendix A	85
Appendix B	87

Introduction

One of the outstanding values of E.S.E.A. Title III may ultimately prove to be the techniques that develop as a result of school officials being compelled to provide meaningful evaluations of the work they have done with the money they have been given. Presently, the evaluation of even the simplest educational programs is at best a questionable undertaking. Nevertheless, old techniques of evaluation must be used and new techniques must be adopted if we are to be able to make at least semi-rational choices about the allocation of future funds from whatever source.

The problem of evaluation, difficult enough in the simplest educational context, becomes enormously more complex when the program to be evaluated involves the improvement of human learning and behavior. The question of whether an individual behaves better this year than he behaved last year is itself unanswerable. The extent to which any given school service contributed to such a behavior change is, given the state of the art of evaluation, a question which no sane investigator would endeavor to consider.

It follows that, in evaluating the program under consideration, the investigators have had to look at process rather than at product. Even the analysis of process had to be second hand, using the best available sources for the information we used. Specifically, we have had to talk to teachers, students, and child behavior consultants to find out what their perceptions were regarding their respective functions and contributions. These reports are bound

to disagree, but the areas in which reports are essentially congruent provide us with the most solid ground available for making generalizations.

Chapter I of the present study analyzes the original objectives of the program and the pre-operational training for the implementation of the program.

Chapter II is a refined analysis of the roles played by the CBCs, relying not only upon questionnaire data but also upon case studies provided by the CBCs themselves as being representative of the functions they were performing.

Chapter III is based on extensive interviews with teachers and students. Since a process is being evaluated at second-hand, their points of view serve to modify the points made by the CBCs. Further, teacher and student comment is the best source we have regarding the ways in which they actually used the service, a question which is very different from the question of what services were actually available.

In Chapter IV, a study is described which was initiated to determine whether there were actual personality differences between students who were and were not referred for help to the CBC. Though the findings of the chapter must be weighed carefully, the suggestion that actual personality differences did exist is, perhaps, one of the strongest indications that the program being studied has merit, at least as a concept for further programming.

Chapter V uses data gained from questionnaires provided to the behavior consultants to analyze whether their roles came to be

what they had originally anticipated they would be. This chapter is, therefore, not only a summary of what actually happened to the program in the opinion of the CBCs, but it is also a statement of the functions they felt they had provided within the school setting.

In Chapter VI, the objectives of the program are restated and an attempt is made to comment generally on the extent to which those objectives were implemented, as determined by the preceding chapters. Further, conclusions and recommendations are presented, some of which flow from the data gathered and some of which are the product of other experiences gained by the author in the course of working with the CBCs.

Acknowledgements

The evaluation to be reported is the combined work of Dr. Richard Stevic, Richard Palmer, and myself. Dr. Stevic, from the guidance department of the School of Education at the University of New York at Buffalo, was responsible for compiling the analysis of case studies presented in Chapter II. Richard Palmer, a graduate student in psychology from the State University of New York at Buffalo, conducted the tests and prepared the report presented in Chapter IV, in addition to preparing and evaluating the questionnaire material report in Chapter V. My own responsibilities involved collecting and preparing the material reported in Chapters I and III. Despite this fairly clear division of labor, there was actually considerable cooperation and consultation among the three of us in developing the report. Ultimately, however, the structuring of the report is my responsibility, and I must bear whatever fault there is for shortcomings in the present evaluation.

We feel deeply indebted to the students, teachers, pupil personnel, and school principals whose cooperation made this report possible. Particularly, we are indebted to the child behavior consultants, who assisted us at all times and whose suggestions have much improved this report.

Finally, we want especially to thank Roger Reger, the Project Director, for providing an atmosphere in which we might conduct an objective evaluation, whatever it might indicate. Although his suggestions were very useful, they were never directive.

Kenneth Cross

CHAPTER I

Selection and Training of Child Behavior Consultants

The Concept.--The idea of using an individual in the school setting as a consultant in child behavior or child development is not itself new. Generally, however, such consultants have been trained psychologists or sociologists working, often, without much regard for the teaching-learning situation within the school. The child behavior consultants used in the program in the First Supervisory District of Erie County were unique in that, first and foremost, they were teachers. Although they were given special training, to be reported in this chapter, their primary skills were teaching skills. Moreover, students and, generally, teachers regarded them as teachers, not as special pupil personnel workers.

Child behavior consultants were to be freed from all formal teaching responsibilities, in order that they might assist students in improving their behavior and in order that they might consult with teachers in improving classroom management.

The organization of the training program of the C.B.S.s can be better understood if the reader first knows what functions the C.B.S.s were being instructed to perform. The reasons for the inclusion of the various parts of the training in the summer session can be best understood when seen in the perspective of the type of work the C.B.C. was being trained to do.

Roger Reger, the project director, compiled a list of functions which would adequately describe the expected role of the C.B.C. and which could be utilized by the C.B.C.s and/or their respective administrations as a guide in the definition of the C.B.C.'s role within his particular school. The written statements of the C.B.C.s after completion of the training program indicate that the C.B.C.s did incorporate these suggested functions into their own role expectations. This same basic list of functions, with the addition or deletion of only a very few was included in virtually all the C.B.C.s' papers, most often as a direct quotation from Mr. Reger, but occassionally with some rewording.

This list seems to be the best single representation of the varied functions of the C.B.C.s, and is presented here to serve as a context from which the training program can be more meaningfully viewed.

Summary of the C.B.C.'s Functions

1. To assist regular classroom teachers when individual children become momentarily upset or unmanageable.
2. To assist these children in overcoming their disturbances and make a smooth transition back into the classroom.
3. To assist teachers on technical curriculum matters regarding specific childrens' deviant behavior or general unresponsiveness to the classroom situation.
4. When appropriate, to work in small groups during scheduled or unscheduled periods with problem children in efforts designed

to prevent more serious behavioral difficulties, or at times on tutorial activities when a need exists for an additional "boost" in certain academic areas.

5. To serve as a liason between child and classroom teacher and school psychologists, social workers, guidance counselors, and administrators.
6. To assist children who may be returning from institutional or special class placements to make an adjustment back into the general curriculum program.
7. To alert all teachers in the local school unit to available specialized curriculum materials for use with unresponsive or over-responsive children.
8. To develop increasing sophistication personally and among other staff members in the early detection of behavioral or learning problems and to take the initiative in developing local methods of prevention and educational treatment.
9. To convince school personnel that the services of Child Behavior Consultants are available to the total curriculum program.
10. To engage in a continuous process of self-examination, study, and inservice training to improve role clarity, technical know-how, and skills in dealing with the behavior of children and of colleagues.

Training Program

The description of the training program is the most difficult part of this evaluation because the investigator was not a participant in these sessions, and must rely entirely upon the reports

and notes of the individuals who attended, organized or were connected in some capacity with the summer course. Because this information is extremely sketchy, this evaluation will attempt to present only a general view of the training, including very few details.

The 18 member schools of the Board of Cooperative Services were informed of the inception and the nature of the program, and asked to submit applications of individuals they chose to participate. Each school made its own selection, aware that the selectee would function as a C.B.C. in the school at which he had been employed during the previous school year. This stipulation served two functions: 1.) It prevented the school from sending some incompetent or unpopular but nevertheless tenured person to the program in hopes of his placement in some other school, and; 2.) made the establishment of teacher-C.B.C. rapport faster and easier because the C.B.C. would be returning to his colleagues of the previous year. No criterion were presented to the schools to serve as a basis for the selection of the canidates.

Twenty C.B.C. candidates were chosen by the schools and completed the six-week training program. However, final negotiations on funding of the program proper were not complete until the middle of September and prior commitments by several schools prohibited the use of 8 of the trainees as C.B.C.s. Of the remaining 12, 2 functioned as a C.B.C. for only one-half of the school year, and 4 were relatively inactive at the termination of the year; the latter group could not be included in the evaluation.

The summer training that was instituted lasted six weeks, with sessions starting at 9 A.M. each day and concluding at 3 P.M. Experts from a wide range of fields, including psychology, psychiatry, social work, education, speech, and language, served as consultants for the program. All consultants were selected because they were competent in some area closely related to the function of the C.B.C. The consultants were used to present to the C.B.C.s the views and services available in the wide range of fields with which the C.B.C. would have contact in performing the role assigned him. Some of the consultants persented two opposing views from within the same field, permitting the C.B.C. to weigh the opinions of each and use the one he found most logical, useful, or convenient as the basis for his future responses related to this topic. Some consultants were selected because their opinions were controversial, others because their views were well accepted within their profession and relatively uncontroversial.

The consultant did not merely give a speech to the trainees, but briefly presented his points and then engaged the C.B.C.s in a discussion related to his topic or to his field. Apparently, all the outside specialists were involved in this interaction with the C.B.C.s.

An additional emphasis was placed upon articles from some of the psychological, psychiatric, and educational journals, including such divers titles as "The Alteration of Behavior in a Special Classroom Situation" (Zimmerman and Zimmerman, 1962), "Acquisition of Language by Deaf Children with Other Disabilities" (Withrow,1966),

and "The Myth of Mental Illness" (Szasz, 1960).

The C.B.C.s traveled to some special facilities and had some experience with materials designed for special educational uses. The use of positive or negative reinforcement to strengthen or extinguish classroom responses, depending upon their desirability, was heavily emphasized in the program. This is frequently mentioned in the notes and is exemplified by the use in the training program of the article "Modification and Maintenance of Behavior Through Systematic Application of Consequences" (Whelan and Haring, 1966). Dr. Ogden R. Lindsley, an exponent of the use of environmental reinforcement to alter behavior, appears to have been one of the integral speakers for the program.

The training did not cease at the end of this special six week session, but continued throughout the year as a series of weekly meetings devoted to study, consultative assistance, inservice training, and group discussions.

The most general feature of the program was the accent placed on variety; in the fields and in the viewpoints of the consultants, and in the several methods of instruction; with the emphasis on all types of behavior deviations pervading the entire course.

Bibliography

Szasz, Thomas S. The myth of mental illness. The American Psychologist. February 1960, 18, pp. 113-118.

Whelan, Richard F. and Haring, Norris, G. Modification and maintenance of behavior through systematic application of consequences. Exceptional Children. January 1966, 32, pp. 281-289.

Withrow, Frank B. Acquisition of language by deaf children with other disabilities. The Volta Review. January, 1966, 68, no. 1.

Zimmerman, Elaine H. and Zimmerman, Joseph. The alteration of behavior in a special classroom situation. Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior. January 1962, 5 no. 1, pp. 59-60.

CHAPTER II

Case Studies

Before any attempt at determining the effectiveness with which the C.B.C.'s functioned it is necessary to understand the expectations which were attached to the position. What role did the C.B.C. assume? Chapter I contains preliminary expectations which those persons who organized the program thought essential. Chapter III contains the perceptions of various persons involved in some way with the services provided by the C.B.C. The intent of the present portion of the report is to examine the role of the C.B.C. from an operative point of view and from the perspective of the C.B.C. himself.

The C.B.C. program was based upon the general need in the school for a person to work with students who, for various reasons, could not continue normal classroom activities. In some instances the problem was one of tutorial assistance aimed at helping the student stay with or catch up with his group. In other cases the situation was behaviorally oriented and the student needed assistance in coping with various personal concerns. The C.B.C. worked with students for varying lengths of time including some cases where the involvement was over a period of one school year. In addition to the factors listed above the school situations in which the C.B.C.s worked were sufficiently different as to preclude one statement concerning role or task areas. Thus a rather lengthy statement could be prepared, but there would be little assurance

that any one reading the statement and then going to the school of the C.B.C. might recognize the relationship which exists.

It is possible to identify certain types of students which cut across the schools and with whom the consultant might have had contact. It is also possible to examine, at some length and depth, one student in several categories to determine the amount and type of involvement of the C.B.C. For this purpose the C.B.C.s were asked to prepare a case study on one student with whom he worked during the year. No attempt was made to structure the choice of student and thus the cases may not be a completely typical client of the consultant during the year. The case does represent a type of student which is found in most schools. The reader will also note that the cases are not all successes since in some cases considerably more time and effort will be necessary.

The C.B.C.s were asked to list the types of students they worked with during the academic year. The list which follows represents the responses which the consultants gave for this question. No ordering is intended since this was not part of the concern, namely, which demanded the most time, effort, and so forth.

1. Failing students.
2. Underachieving students.
3. Classroom disruptors.
4. Immature students.
5. Students with anti-social behaviors.
6. Students who were easily distracted in the classroom.
7. Students facing value conflicts.

8. Students who seem to reject reality.

9. Rebellious individuals.

10. Students who do not complete and/or turn in assignments.

11. Hostile students.

As the reader will note, this list includes a wide range of student types. In order to promote better student adjustment in these categories the C.B.C. was forced to utilize a wide range of activities. These included tutorial activities, individual consultation with teachers, one-to-one interviewing with students, and group work to list a few. The case studies which follow are intended to report a portion of the C.B.C.s role as performed by the consultant. Role theory suggests that this is one way of determining role; namely, studying what the actor does in fulfilling the position to which he is assigned. As part of the case study the consultant listed the degree of success and a projection as to future activities necessary to continue to promote optimum personal development for the student.

CASE A illustrates a student who was identified as an academic failure. It is obvious that the causes and concerns are multi-faceted and that failure is not the sole factor which is involved in the case. However, student A is not achieving as much academically as he might and in most school settings this is a cause for concern.

Background on student; A is 12 years old and in the fifth grade. He wears glasses and has had speech correction in the past. He is failing in most academic areas.

He was retained in the first grade following a transfer from parochial to public school. He tests below grade in achievement. He has the capacity to learn but is achieving only minimally. He is the youngest of three boys and has a younger sister who has caught up with him in school.

Student report: A is interested in his father's work. He states that he wants to do what his father does. When the question of preparation and aptitude are raised he responds that when he needs to do something he will be able. He likes boating which is a hobby of his father.

C.B.C. Report: His relationship with teachers has been one of indifference on the student's part and frustration for the teachers. He has very little ambition or interest in school. It appears that there is difficulty in relating to the father. A reflects similar traits in that he is at times distant and shuts out people. The family appears to be in the middle to upper-middle class economically. A has been referred to the psychiatric clinic and has been there for at least one interview. He appears to realize that he has problems but will not try to help himself. He ignores any attempt to help him. He has not had success in academic areas and perhaps has feelings of inadequacy.

Parent Report: His mother is most concerned regarding school work. There appears to be less concern over

personal problems. The father is a "self made" success and appears to take lightly the suggestions of the school personnel. Home cooperation with the school has been limited but they have taken him for psychiatric assistance. The parents appear to have the same unrealistic outlook that A has.

Statement of Problem: A has a severe academic problem. He is highly underachieving, in fact, he completes little of the school work assignments. He becomes upset when pressured and does not have good social relations with his peers.

Method of Operation: The C.B.C. provided individual meetings with A for the purpose of tutorial assistance and to provide an opportunity for A to know himself better. In both cases A choose not to become involved and so other personnel were involved. The school psychologist has tested him and in terms of academic potential find no problems. Finally referral to psychiatric clinic was suggested. Within the classroom framework there was an attempt to provide a success experience by allowing to complete whatever work he wished. A "follow through" program was established in cooperation with the home. Other pupil personnel specialists of the school have worked with him on various occasions.

Outcomes: Although school personnel are fairly certain concerning A's problem no positive outcomes can be

reported due to non-participation of A in the general activity necessary to identify and understand his concerns. The major outcome is that a student has been identified and needs further assistance in order to successfully cope with the many concerns and problems he is facing. Although the personnel involved were not able to accomplish the desired goals of behavior change and increased self-knowledge he will receive continuing assistance in the school.

Projections: There is a need to provide specialized help for the boy. He has already been referred to a psychiatric clinic. It appears that school personnel will be involved since a portion of the concern is related to academic achievement and projected vocational plans. In all probability he will be promoted and this means additional tutorial helps to make up what he has not attained this year plus staying up with the material of the sixth grade.

CASE B is a description of an underachieving student. This is a most common problem in schools. He may come from any ability level and presents to the teacher and supportive personnel a real dilemma. Student B has had a history of failure and underachievement but during the school year just completed was 'passing' his school work.

Background Material: B is an 11-year-old fourth grade student. He was retained in grade 1. At the time of the contact with C.B.C. his measured I.Q. was 86 and

reading achievement was 2.0, about 2.5 below grade level. He was referred by his teacher. B is the oldest of three children.

Student Report: B reported that his mother made him do "girls work" at home and he was not happy doing the work. He had a dog, more related to being a boy, but was forced to give it up when it got too big. He is involved is scouting and reports he likes this. He did not care for school during the initial period of meeting with the consultant. He reported that he was unhappy with his classroom teacher. He is a dreamer. He likes his father but sees little of him. His mother works and as a result he must go to an aunt's house after school. This again is not particularly well received by B.

Consultant Report: B was shy when he first reported to the office. He did not look at the consultant. He was neat in dress and appeared to be in good health. During the ten-month period in which the consultant worked with B he became a lively and active boy in the office. He tried to improve his schoolwork. Many topics were discussed during this time, some of which are suggested under the self-report section. He was and is a child who needs more attention than he gets.

Others: Teacher - The teacher referred the student to the consultant. His school work was very poor. He was late for school at least twice per week. His homework

was never completed. That portion he did complete was sloppy. In the classroom he always had his fingers in his mouth. (This was not true during time in consultant's office.) Although the consultant noticed a change in behavior and attitude, the opposite was true according to the teacher.

Mother: The mother confirmed B's report that he was required to perform work at home, such as doing the dishes, but felt that this was reasonable.

Father: The father blames the mother for the trouble with B. He suggests this because of mother's religious training prior to marriage. He felt that this caused the mother to have some question concerning her role and that she was not as much a mother to B as to the second and third children.

General Statement of Concern: Along with the problem of below level achievement, the student appears to have some difficulty relating to his parents. He also has some social adjustment difficulties.

Method of Operation: Regular meetings were held with B during the year. These included individual assistance with study skills and the building of a relationship between the C.B.C. and B. The basic assumption which was made is that someone must care about B, and try to help him understand his concerns and himself better. The C.B.C. was able to provide some of the aid due to the

one-to-one relationship. There is also an attempt to work with the family to improve understanding and acceptance.

Outcomes:

1. The reading achievement of the student improved.
2. During the time spent with the C.B.C., his interpersonal skill was markedly better. However, this apparently did not transfer outside the office.
3. He has begun to understand himself. He is able to verbalize certain concerns and to work toward their solution, e.g. reading.
4. He is being transferred to a different school due to mother's belief that the public school will be able to do a lot for the child. (The child was enrolled in a private, parochial school.)

Projection: B will need continued assistance. If the classroom teacher does not provide substantial support and encouragement the pattern may be repeated next year. If the teacher works with the student he appears to be able to adjust to the school and home situations.

CASE C is a student who disrupts the normal functioning of the class to a degree that he can often not be tolerated in the classroom. Teachers are most concerned about this type of student because he demands so much attention that the other class members must be neglected. When the student obtains attention by acting out or other disruptive

activities the concern is more acute because other students often misinterpret the situation and are tempted to obtain attention in similar ways. Obviously the student needs individualized help but whether the teacher has the time to provide this aid is a crucial question.

Student Background: C is 10-years-old and in grade four. His marks are satisfactory in Language Arts but low in mathematics. He does achieve in some areas above grade level. His ability test scores indicate average ability. He is presently in his fifth school, the most recent transfer was from a parochial to public school. He is the oldest of 3 children and has a brother and sister. He comes from a middle class home. He does not complete his work during class time but will do it after school. He likes baseball and enjoys helping around the school.

Student Report: He is unhappy at home but feels he is treated fairly. He does not want to leave home. He is afraid of his father but likes to spend time with him. He describes himself in what might be called a defeated attitude. He often is disappointed when he behaves poorly. He thinks other children do not like him and is very anxious to have friends. However, he alienates his friends by his behavior.

C.B.C. Report: C is outgoing and sensitive to troubles of others. He is polite to adults and interested in many things. He tends to get tired during the afternoon.

His coordination is below average.

Teacher: The teacher reports that she likes him personally but in the classroom his behavior is aggravating and intolerable. She referred him to the C.B.C.

Parents: The parents manifest a concern over C's school adjustment. At the school psychologist's suggestion he was taken to Family Service. They report that he gets along with his brother and sister. There appears to have been a problem of father-son relationship early in life since the father was older when married and apparently did not spend much time with C. The father believes that firm discipline, a typical behavior for the mother, is what is needed.

Pupil Personnel: The psychologist suggests possibilities of cerebral dysfunction of a minimal nature. The school nurse reports that C needed more medical assistance than the average student. However, a physical examination did not indicate any physical problem.

Statement of Problem: C has a behavior problem which is manifested in misconduct in class. Related to this are distractability, inability to control impulses, afternoon fatigue and emotional difficulties which may be related to self and interpersonal relationships.

Method of Operation: The following techniques were employed.

1. Individual counseling was provided to assist adjustment to class.

2. Incentives were given for desirable behavior. The student could earn points with which he could buy a toy or other object.
3. When necessary the student was sent to the office of the C.B.C. to relieve the classroom situation for the teacher.
4. The C.B.C. contacted the parents to suggest certain activities which might be useful in aiding C.

Outcomes: He will be placed in a special class where the behavior can be controlled and perhaps alleviated more easily. Although the results with the C.B.C. and other personnel have not achieved the desired goals, the efforts this year have identified the boy as needing specialized attention in the future.

Projections: It is hoped that the student will be able to learn more about himself and the accepted mode of behavior for the classroom. When self-control occurs in the home and in the school he should be able to return to the regular classroom. Further investigation into the nature of the problem and probable causes is indicated and the work during the year has provided the basis for his continuing type of activity.

CASE D is a student who is below a desireable level in emotional maturity. As such he presents a difficult problem for school personnel. These students demand more attention than other age-

mates, they are more easily distracted, and, in general, are more difficult to teach.

Background on Student: D is 7-years-old and a first grade student. He was referred by the teacher. He is the oldest of four children. School achievement is well below average. He will be retained in first grade due to low reading achievement.

Student Report: He likes to go home and play. He gets along with the rest of his family. His hobbies are few. He reports walking and playing in fields as leisure time activity. He does not give any particular likes or dislikes.

C.B.C. Report: He is basically a happy child. He has alternate active and sleepy periods. He daydreams much of the time and is distracted easily. Often his responses do not make sense. He walks on his tiptoes rather than the normal way. He is neat in appearance and is apparently healthy. He is friendly with adults. He has a tendency to show off.

Others: Teachers - The teacher reports that D has no friends at school. His relationship with the teacher is poor. He shows off in the classroom. His school behavior has improved and the teachers are better satisfied with him than at the beginning of the year. He has a short attention span, hyperactivity, and is constantly moving and talking. In general, he acts very babyish in the classroom.

Social worker at local agency - His tests indicate reading difficulty but some strength in arithmetic. Further contacts were not scheduled since the social worker did not think it necessary. The basic problem, in her estimation, is the babyishness.

Statement of Problem: D manifests the behavior listed earlier. His manner of walking and outbursts in class specifically are noted. He cannot sit still and in addition to constant movement and talk, wants to play after a few minutes work. He rolls his arms and head on the desk at times. Often his assigned classroom work is not completed.

Method of Operation: The C.B.C. provided individual assistance for the student in academic areas as well as providing a one-to-one situation where he could calm down. Immediate efforts focused upon understanding the child and his behavior. Long range efforts would focus upon helping the child fit into the classroom and become a more adequate learner.

Outcome:

1. His reading has improved but is still below expected level.
2. He is still a behavior problem although not as bad as before. The teachers indicate better behavior on his part.
3. The babyishness still continues.

4. He continues to be a good math student.

Projections: There is a need to provide specialized assistance for this student. In addition, his behavior should be checked more thoroughly to insure that the problem is not of a more severe nature. Both psychological and medical assistance would be beneficial to the student. He may need to be placed in a special class for a period of time in order to work out academic, social, and personal problems.

CASE E represents a student who exhibits anti-social behavior. In our present society it is becoming difficult for each person to completely differentiate socially acceptable norms of behavior from anti-social behaviors. One needs only to contemplate various double standards which are present to understand the dilemma which the student faces in determining what behaviors are acceptable. In the Case of study below the problem is increased since the student functions in what must be described as an adult world.

Background of Student: The student is almost 13-years-old and has completed grade five. His measured intelligence is about average but his achievement is well below average (D range). He has been referred to a local psychiatric clinic for personal problems. His mother died during the school year. His father's work keeps him from having much contact with the boy. He is the only child of the present marriage although he has 2 older stepbrothers.

Student Report: Nothing much from the student except a report that he is pretty much left on his own. For example, he travels most places on the bus alone. His world appears to be more adult-oriented; he often uses first names when talking to adults.

C.B.C. Report: He is large. E appears to know his way around. He seems comfortable in adult company, including that of the C.B.C. He does not seem to accept efforts of the school to show him that someone cares. Efforts made at the time of the mother's death, although seemingly meaningful at the time, apparently did not have long range effects on the behavior of E. He seemed eager to please the C.B.C. during the sessions and to demonstrate that reported behavior outside the C.B.C. office was typical. He does seem to alternate between being well and poorly behaved.

Others: Teacher - He is reported as a bully, very vulgar, rude and with no respect for authority. Although the teachers made every effort to provide individual assistance to E during the year his behavior was so bad that he is described as morally unfit to continue in the regular classroom with young children. Specifically, the teachers were concerned about his interpretation of various parts of the classroom as having sexual or dirty connotations. This combined with his knowledge of the adult world seem to make him a bit too risque in his approach to the classroom.

Father - His father did not appear to know very much about E and this, in itself, suggests the degree of potential problem.

Statement of Problem: He is considered a bully, very rude and quite vulgar. He has little or no respect for authority and in the classroom disrupts the normal procedure by various off-color comments and undesirable activities.

Method of Operation:

1. There were one-to-one meetings with the C.B.C. in which E was encouraged to examine his behavior.
2. Often the use of descriptive behavior patterns were included in order for E to have a better idea of what was expected.
3. Regular meetings were held with psychologist and teacher to try to understand E and to devise meaningful methods of helping him.
4. The C.B.C. recontacted the clinic to make an appointment for E. Included here was a contact with the father and explanation of information to the father.

Outcomes: In this case there are no immediate outcomes to report. Although the student manifested acceptable behavior at times, there was no continuing pattern which seemed to portend any great change for the future. He is supposed to return to the clinic for professional assistance.

Projection: There is a need to continue the professional assistance. In school someone must take a personal interest in him, try to understand him, convey this to him and help him understand himself. If this occurs it may be possible to help this student to be a productive member of society.

CASE F is a student, quite young, who already exhibits a greater degree of distractability than would be considered normal. Each of us is distracable to a degree by outside stimuli. When this stimuli becomes the major focus of attention the individual is in need of assistance to learn more meaningful methods of operation.

Background on Student: F is 7 years old and completing the first grade. She was referred early in the year by the teacher. She is an only child. She appears to be an able student not inclined to work up to level.

Student Report: There is a limited amount of material of a self reported nature. However, the girl did keep records during the year when the consultant established certain types of behavior. Two specific examples are included. First she recorded the number of times she talked out in class. This report covered 25 days and the number reported ranged from 1 to 10 with an average for the first 8 days of about 7. Following this there was a disciplinary action following each talk-out. The average dropped to 4. However, each day there was at least one talk out.

The second report concerned the number of times out of seat. The range here was 0 to 11 with the

first 8 days averaging 6. With similar disciplinary action the average was reduced to 2 per day. No other personal observations can be included.

C.B.C. Report: The consultant was involved in meeting with F for about 9 months. Two observational techniques were used. The first included timing the math and reading responses per minute when F was given specific problems. The median was 5.2 for 14 work sessions.

Second the consultant reported the time required to complete all work assigned. The earliest reported time was 11:30 A.M. but in some cases she had to take her work home and spend up to 2 hours completing it there.

F is reported to be easily distracted from work. She misinterprets certain parts of her invironment and thus may behave in ways which are completely inappropriate. For example, on one self observation F felt that the greater the number of talk outs the better, rather than understanding the involvement of the teacher or consultant as attempts to decrease the number.

Others: Teacher - Teacher reported F as an intelligent student who has good vocabulary. She is hyperactive and needs to channel enthusiasm and knowledge along right paths. The teacher referred F because she was loud, frequently out of her seat, inattentive and, in general, inadequate in interpersonal relationships.

The teacher also reported specific behaviors which were not acceptable. For example, F would swing her sneaker bag at children near her and sometimes would hit them with the bag. She would interrupt work periods with talk or by getting out of her seat. She was unable to stay with an assignment.

Psychologist - Earlier, based upon test results, the psychologist reported that F is inattentive, rigid, in need of oral expressiveness, and excitable. Her test results on reading achievement were about normal. Later in the year the psychologist reported hysteroid symptoms and misinterpretation of environmental stimuli.

Mother - The student was given a complete physical examination to determine whether any physical abnormality was a cause of hyperactivity. The tests proved negative. The mother suggested that such classes as art, physical education, music and library were meaningful even though efforts to utilize these as motivational factors did not confirm this. F was put on medication by her peditrician but the mother stopped its use because it was ineffective and she felt F would become dependent upon drugs.

General Statement of Problem: F is inattentive and frequently out of her seat. She is distracted easily, often does not complete her school work. In general she does not seem to function well in the academic setting. She has certain personal problems which affect her classroom

activity. It appears that misinterpretation of reality is a very serious problem.

Method of Operation: A number of methods were used in order to locate and ameleorate F's problems.

1. She was given the observational tasks described earlier.
2. The C.B.C. established a reward system whereby the student earned points by proper activity. The points could be accumulated to buy certain toys.
3. Classroom procedures were introduced to control for the problem of distraction. A screen was placed around the student's desk to block out all stimuli during study periods.
4. She was allowed out of the screen when she completed her work, when her reading group met, when she needed to use the lavatory and during the normal school drills.
5. She also could earn the right to eat in the cafeteria and participate in special classes if she completed her work.
6. Finally, the C.B.C. became involved in immediate reinforcement of acceptable behavior. In place of earning points F was given various prizes or other reinforcers if she completed her work.

Outcome:

1. In general the behavioral manipulations were not as effective as anticipated with the student. Part of this is due to the type of manipulation, part due to misunderstanding F, and part due to F's personal problems.
2. She did complete assignments with greater frequency and the performance was better.
3. Although far from adequate, her classroom behavior was better.
4. Her interpersonal relationships with teacher and students is reported to be better.
5. She remains in her seat when told.

Projection: The work during the year is only a beginning. The student has a long ways to go and will need a person who is sympathetic to her and is willing to work with her. It appears that F will need further individualized assistance.

In CASE G the student is faced with a problem involving values and commitments to values which may be considerably different from those of her parents. The values of our society are tenuous and under increased examination today. This area is of special concern to the adolescent who must sort out the peer values and parental values and combine these into a meaningful set for personal use. Thus the student is testing the adult structure while trying to find the 'right' values for his own use. When the adult structure is fairly rigid, as in the case below, the problem is more intense.

Background on Student: She is an eighteen-year-old just finishing the junior year. She is small and very thin. She wears heavy make-up placing emphasis on her eyes. She manifests certain nervous mannerisms such as hair twisting to a greater degree than most girls of her age. She has missed about 80 days this school year due to colds, minor illnesses, her mother's illnesses and skipping school. She is well dressed in the latest style. She has average ability but is an underachiever. However, she has not been retained. She is an adopted child. The parents have two natural children who are younger than G. Her high school program includes a homemaking class and distributive education class which do not seem to be of interest to her.

Student Report: She reports a number of borderline behavior incidents which may provide an indication of her own self feelings. She says that she skips school to be with boys who pick her up before school. By her report she has observed gluesniffing and illicit relations by some of her friends in motels. She has not done this, she says. She has been peiked up for stealing and has been disciplined in school for drinking on school property. She says she hates her father and cannot stand her sick mother. She would like to leave home. She feels that "decent" boys would not like her. She broke up with her steady because she said she would cheat on him. She does not like boys to touch her even when dancing.

C.B.C. Report: She is listless and has a low frustration level. Her goals and values seem to be outside the normally accepted societal goals. She seems to like to be close to questionable "fun" but does not like to accept the consequences of her behavior. She appears to have a poor self-image. She manifests a feeling of insecurity with peers and with any boy. This is true even though she does go various places with boys. She apparently has some money which was given her by her real grandfather. She is most certainly a potential dropout this summer due to dissatisfaction with self and school. C.B.C. was often a sounding board in stress times.

Parents: The parents report that they adopted G because "it was the Christian thing to do." They have made visible efforts to provide a meaningful life for her. The father uses the mothers sickness to control G's behavior. For example, the father has suggested that the mother might not recover if G does not change her behavior.

Teachers: Various teachers report that G does not complete her work and daydreams in class. She causes disturbances in the class when any pressure is put on her to complete work. She has been able to maintain passing averages with flurries of work. Generally, she does not have a stable work record.

Family Service: The caseworker, two years ago, found her unresponsive and referred her back to the school.

Statement of Problem: She manifests emotional instability and immaturity. She seems to have a conflict in the area of values. Her closest associates in school do not have the strong middle class value system of her parents. She is moving toward more social behavior to satisfy her needs and this causes more problems for her.

Method of Operation:

1. The consultant was available when necessary to help alleviate stressful periods.
2. Since the weekend was always a potential time of problems, each Friday conferences were held to discuss plans and to look at alternate possibilities.
3. Continuous reinforcement was given to those behaviors which related to positive self image.
4. Group efforts, including movies and filmstrips, were used to illustrate socially acceptable behavior patterns.
5. She was tutored in academic areas when appropriate.
6. She was referred to other persons for increased specialized assistance.

Outcome: She seems to be able to face various situations in her life more realistically. She has reduced her exaggerations and handles stress better. Her school attendance toward the end of the year was better. She participates in various school events which is a change from previous involvement.

Projections: Although the efforts have been stop-gap, the direction of the behavior change is toward the positive side. The problem or problems have built up for a number of years and thus will take some time to be understood and appropriate behavior manifested. There is a need to continue individualized assistance with the girl. Hopefully, by coordinating the efforts of several other professionals the C.B.C. could provide assistance to the student toward greater self understanding and social adequacy.

CASE H is perhaps the least typical of the group of studies. However, it does illustrate the range of problem areas which have effects upon students. We are accustomed to the non-acceptance of our own abilities, limitations and so forth. When this extends to the realities of life and death we are a bit more concerned. Case H appears to be a student who was unable to accept the death of a parent and this affected his personal and academic functioning.

Background of Student: H is a 12-year-old seventh grader. Five years ago his father died. The mother has assumed the responsibility of raising H, his older brother and sister, and his younger brother. He appears to have average ability and did 70-80 work in his seventh grade work. He was referred to the C.B.C. for assistance in study habits, academic areas, and general attitude.

Student Report: He reports that he likes to fish, camp,

collect sea shells and read in his hobby areas. A man in the neighborhood takes him and the family on fishing and camping trips. He has suggested that he is interested in becoming a game warden, going into forestry, or perhaps opening a pet shop. Although his father is dead, H, early in the series of interviews, would continue to include him as part of the family. He has talked about his father's death and indicated the degree to which this has affected him in his own life and in his relationship with adult males.

C.B.C. Report: The C.B.C. reports him to be a fluent and verbal boy. His family, prior to and since the death of the father, is a closely knit group that does many things together. Although there was concern over the adjustment of the student to school, the consultant's main concern was with the inability of the boy to accept his father's death and a lack of meaningful relationships with most adult males. The exception here appears to be the man who takes the family on various outings. He does not like pressure situations and appears to rebel at formal structures.

Teachers: In general the teachers report a change in H's attitude toward himself and the school. His behavior is more acceptable to them and in some cases the academic achievement is closer to the expected level. This is in contrast to earlier refusals to complete and turn in assignments.

Mother: The mother expressed concern over H's behavior but was unable to cope successfully with the problem. She is most cooperative and has kept in contact with the C.B.C. during the year. H appears to be the only family member who has the concerns listed above.

Statement of Problem: H appears to have a major difficulty accepting the death of his father. This stems from a close relationship between his father and him which left a void in his life. The concern apparently was turned inward and H had difficulty to clarify for himself the meaning of his father's death.

Method of Operation:

1. The C.B.C. met with H on a regular basis during the year.
2. In addition to providing academic assistance the C.B.C. attempted to provide another meaningful adult relationship for H.
3. At a point in the interview series when H finally talked about his father the C.B.C. encouraged him to continue this topic of conversation.
4. Continued opportunity was provided for the student to discuss his father and his relationship with men.

Outcomes: In addition to the improvement noted under teacher reactions, H now seems to be more capable of understanding himself and his relationship to others. This provides assistance for better adjustment to school oriented tasks.

Projections: It appears that H has been able to make a successful transition from a completely inner-oriented person to a more social and better adjusted, by societal standards, individual. With the prospect of placing him in those situations where this change can continue to be fostered, his improvement ought to continue. He may need men teachers, at times, to provide this assistance. The pupil personnel staff ought to be available to provide assistance when H desires it.

CHAPTER III

Perception of the Child Behavior Consultants By Students and School Personnel

Purpose -- In the study to be reported in this chapter, the investigators endeavored to obtain answers to two basic questions. The first question involved the ways in which the C.B.C.'s role was perceived by the teachers and students with whom he worked. The determination of such roles led us to information which would make it possible to determine whether or not the C.B.C. was essentially different in function from the other personnel of the school. Our working hypothesis was that, with the exception of the fact that there would be more time available for such activities, the C.B.C. would behave very much as did the classroom teachers with whom he was associated. This supposition seemed to us to be in accord with the fact that the selection procedures for obtaining C.B.C.'s involved selection by local principals from their staff of competent and experienced teachers.

Procedures -- It has already been pointed out that the C.B.C. for each school had his tasks determined by the exigencies of the situation of his particular school. It is not surprising that some of the C.B.C.s were involved in activities in which the questions posed above would have had relatively little meaning. Therefore, we confined our analysis to those eight schools where the functions of the C.B.C. seemed to indicate that the proposed study would be meaningful. The proposed group had worked with more than 150 teachers and more than 700 students. Obviously,

some techniques had to be developed for sampling this vast number of individuals, particularly since it was felt that open-ended, partially-structured interviews would be most helpful in determining the kind of information we were seeking.

The Sample -- Each C.B.C. was asked to divide the students with whom he was working into seven categories on the basis of success with the student. Success was defined in terms of modification of a learning or behavioral problem. Since no more than one-seventh of the students could be listed in any category, the scale was relative--the possibility was not precluded that all student changes were successful. The investigators then selected students four groups from which interviewees would be chosen: groups 2, 3, 5, and 6. In this way, these rated as most successful and least successful were by-passed, presuming that their comments would represent a distorted picture of the daily activities of the C.B.C.s.

In those instances where each category contained more than ten persons, a table of random numbers was used to reduce the number of interviewees. In those cases where the number was below ten, all students in the group were interviewed.

Since the student group was randomly selected, no random selection procedure was used to determine the teachers to be interviewed. Instead, the investigators interviewed all those teachers who worked with the students interviewed. This procedure had the advantage of providing a relatively unselected group of teachers who, at the same time, would provide us with comments

regarding the same student population with which we were working.

Interview Procedures -- Both student and teacher interviews were tape recorded, but only after explaining that the recording would be confidential and the recording would not take place if there were objections. The seemingly frank answers to be reported suggest that the tape recorder was not a significant barrier between the interviewer and interviewee. Generally speaking, teacher interviews lasted from fifteen to thirty minutes, while student interviews ranged from three to ten minutes in length. This was not by design, but rather because the teachers were simply more verbal, as was expected.

After taping the interviews, impartial observers were asked to take notes on randomly selected recordings to determine whether the investigator's report was significantly biased. Since the interviews were very loosely structured, no statistical validation was used, but responses were rated by the investigator and observers to be congruent.

The Student Interview -- In order to determine the perception of the role of the C.B.C. by students, the following questions were used:

1. What does Mr. __ do in the school?
2. Did you ever go to work with him? Why? (All of the students interviewed had worked with the C.B.C., though seven of them said they had not.)
3. What did he do with you while you were here?
4. Did he punish you?

It should be stressed again that all interviews were loosely structured, so that the questions were not posed in this form. Rather, the questions were integrated into the conversation. The actual questions used were determined and the interview technique was formulated only after eighteen pilot interviews.

The Teacher Interview -- The teacher interview consisted of two parts. In the first part, an attempt was made to determine the teacher's perception of the role of the C.B.C. The questions used were the following:

1. Why did you send students to ---?(the C.B.C.)
2. What did he do with the students you sent?
3. Has he (the C.B.C.) been of help to you in any other ways?
4. Why did you send ---(a particular student) to the C.B.C. rather than to the principal, guidance counselor, or other supportive person?

The second part of the interview was an endeavor to determine the teacher's own disciplinary pattern, the intent being to draw rough comparisons between the style of the C.B.C. and that of the teacher involved. This portion of the interview was especially loosely structured, but sample questions were:

1. If the C.B.C. had not been available, what would you have done with the student?
2. When you did not go to the C.B.C., what did you do with the student?
3. Was it more satisfactory to send the child to the C.B.C. than to deal with the problem yourself or to refer the problem to the principal or some other individual?

Seven pilot interviews were conducted to establish questions and format.

Findings of the Student Interview -- At the conclusion of the study, 143 students had been interviewed. However, due to technical difficulties in tape recording, 17 interviews were unintelligible. Therefore, meaningful responses were selicited from 126 students. Where student responses reported do not total 126, the reason is that students did not respond meaningfully to the question being reported.

Of the 126 meaningful responses, 72 students reported that they were sent to the C.B.C. for tutorial work. However, 28 of this number admitted that they were having instructional problems primarily because they were not paying close attention or because they "fooled around" in class. Forty-seven students said that they were sent to the C.B.C. because they did not behave in class--most commonly listed misbehavior was talking, fighting, and being blamed for what others had done. The following reasons were given by the remaining eight students: "I wet my pants", "I cried because I wanted to go home", "Mrs. --- didn't like me, so she sent me here", "the teacher asked me to come", "I fell asleep in class", "I wanted to talk to her", "he asked me to come", and "I don't know." From these data, it seems reasonable to conclude that, though about two-thirds of all the students interviewed apparently worked with the C.B.C. in a tutorial capacity, at least according to their own perceptions, nearly half recognized that they were working with the C.B.C. at least in part for reasons which involved their own maladaptive behavior. As was expected, there was wide variation in student perception

from school to school. Thus, in one school there was no student who claimed that he had been sent to the C.B.C. because of behavior problems, while in two schools, ninety per cent of the respondents said that they had been sent to the C.B.C. for behavior reasons.

When students were given the C.B.C.'s name and asked what he did in the school, the answers were: guidance counselor, 26; a special teacher who helps students with problems, 53; helps the school nurse, 5; "I don't know", 18; reading teacher, 4; "talks to people with problems like the guys in the movies", 1; helps the principal, 9; "helps teachers who have problems," 3. There was apparently no concensus in students' minds, then, about exactly what the C.B.C. was supposed to do within the school setting, even though these were students who had worked more or less closely with the C.B.C. The students tended, apparently, to identify the function served with the particular experiences he had undergone. Thus, one of the students who thought the C.B.C. was a nurse reported that: "She came in to talk to me while I was in the nurse's office." But this wide variation in role perception may, in fact, be desirable. Further, it seems questionable whether the role of guidance counselor, school nurse, or principal or assistant principal would be any more clearly formulated in the mind of a student, particularly in view of the fact that the preponderance of students questioned, 78 were in the seventh grade or below.

Having determined why students thought they had been sent to the C.B.C. and what they thought the C.B.C. was supposed to do in the school, the interviewer then attempted to establish how the student

perceived what happened to him while working with the behavioral consultants. It should be stressed, before reporting student comments, that there is no necessary connection between what students said happened and what actually did happen. Student reports are significant, however, since they indicate the way in which the student perceived what happened. Since many students gave more than one response, the number of responses exceeds the number of students interviewed. "Sat in his office until the teacher let me back into class", 11; "hollered at me", 27; "helped me with spelling", 37; "talked to me about my problems", 52; "read with me", 24; "made me write a composition", 15; "talked to my parents", 17; "gave me prizes for being good", 26; "made me count how often I was bad", 18; "signed my homework papers", 10; "watched me do my work", 31; "told me not to associate as much with the group of trouble-makers I was in", 9; "told me ways I could get more friends", 1; "sympathized with me", 42. No attempts were made to value these various approaches; however, it seems probable that there is no item suggested by the list which an individual teacher would not also be able to carry out. It must again be stressed, on the other hand, that these comments represent student impressions, and do not necessarily reflect the true situation seen from other perspectives.

Finally, an attempt was made to determine the student's feeling regarding the C.B.C.s. Eighty-four of the students said that they liked the C.B.C. in one degree or another, while 30 students of this number expressed strong dislike toward one or several other individuals. The suggestion made from this expression of dislike for other individuals

is that at least some of the students felt free to express their true opinions. On the other hand, 14 students felt neither liking nor antipathy toward the C.B.C. There was a group of 29 students who expressed general dislike toward the C.B.C. Interestingly, 15 of these students came from the same school setting, but there was at least one other variable which might have led to their response. Since this second variable was common to only one school in the study, it seems unfair to the C.B.C. involved to mention its nature.

Summary of Findings From the Student Interview -- About three-fourths of the students interviewed had established at least a workable arrangement for getting along on a friendly basis with the C.B.C. Further, almost all of the students interviewed felt that they had been sent to the C.B.C. for a clear reason and that something had happened to them consonant with the reason for their being sent. However, from the viewpoint of the student, those techniques employed by the C.B.C. represent techniques similar to those which might be used by any other teacher, even without special knowledge of behavior. Further, writing compositions, sitting in an office, being "yelled" at, suggest student perceptions of less than unquestioned desirability.

Findings of the Teacher Interview -- Fifty teachers were interviewed, and all responses are reportable. In addition, 20 supportive personnel were interviewed, but their comments were not recorded. In this section, only the teacher interviews will be reported. The comments of the supportive personnel form part of the basis for recommendations made in Chapter VI.

Although a structure was provided for the teacher interviews, their responses do not lend themselves to tabulation. The primary reason for this is that the teachers were sufficiently verbal to provide a mass of detail, much of which would be lost by attempting such a tabulation. A less important but significant argument against tabulation is that many of the comments to be reported were made by only one or two individuals. Where there is large agreement, the numbers tending toward such positions are given. Where numbers are not given, the implication intended is that only one or two teachers' opinions are being represented.

1. Tutorial Work - Fourty-two teachers said that one of the ways in which the C.B.C. had been of assistance was through the provision of tutorial instruction for students who, for one reason or another, were having trouble acquiring work in the classroom. Of this group, 25 listed other ways in which the C.B.C. had been of use. This left 17 teachers of the group who had used the C.B.C. for only tutorial purposes. Within this group of 17, 11 said that they recognized that the C.B.C. might perform other functions, but that such functions had not been necessary during that year. On the other hand, 6 teachers said that they thought this was the service that the C.B.C. was supposed to perform and that they had not considered the possibility of any other service being provided. Apparently, then, 12 per cent of the teachers of the sample did not consider the C.B.C. as being involved with behavior.

Tutorial instruction ranged over almost every academic discipline, but the major emphasis was placed upon reading, arithmetic,

and spelling, in that order. Tutoring was generally provided for one of three reasons. Fifteen of the teachers reported that they had referred students who were slow learners generally. (Of course, the term "slow learner" does not preclude the possibility of a personality problem, since the classification was not generally done through objective tests; but, rather, through general class performance.) In this group of 15 teachers referring slow learners, 4 believed that those students tutored had shown improvement. Five teachers reported that they had noticed no improvement, stating the opinion that additional tutoring might, however, yield results. The remaining 6 teachers said that the students referred had not shown improvement, but they added that this was not surprising since they doubted that any amount of tutorial aid would improve the performance of such students.

Eighteen teachers reported that they had referred students for work in 1 or 2 specific subjects. They gave as their reasons that the students referred were doing less well in those subjects than they were doing in their other work. Of the group of 18, 11 reported that the tutoring had brought about an improvement in student performance in the particular subject, while 7 said that the student was doing as badly or worse than he had done before.

The third group sent for tutorial work were sent because specific (but not always defined) behavioral problems were interfering with their learning. Such problems ranged from a death in the family to being involved in a small group who were constantly "clowning." Thirteen of the 42 teachers reported making referrals on this basis,

and 9 of these felt that the tutoring had either improved the child's learning of the subject or had improved his behavior in class, a result which they attributed to greater subject competency.

There was no formal feedback from the C.B.C. to the teacher regarding the material dealt with during tutorial sessions. Either material was sent with the student or the C.B.C. selected material for the tutorial session. Information about the session was furnished to teachers either by consulting with the student--the case with 17 of the teachers--or through informal sessions with the C.B.C., reported by 19 of the teachers. The remaining 6 teachers said that they used both sources for feedback.

Despite the fact that formal feedback seemed to be lacking, teachers did not list this lack as a problem. On the contrary, most of them, 40, said that they knew exactly what the C.B.C. had done with their students. The problem most often listed with regard to tutorial service was that the C.B.C. lacked the time to meet with students often enough to provide meaningful help--19 teachers.

2. Disciplinarian - In the context in which "discipline" is used here, it must be sharply distinguished from behavior modification by the fact that "discipline" connotes a punishment of one form or another. Twenty-four teachers reported that they had referred one or more students specifically for discipline. In all but 6 instances, such referrals occurred in schools where the teachers reported there was no other supportive pupil personnel service. In such cases, referral for discipline had to be made to the C.B.C. or to the principal. Twelve teachers said that they made referrals to

the principal or to the C.D.C. as the case required, but none of these individuals were able to state the criteria used for such referrence. Eight other teachers in schools where there was no supportive service reported that they understood all discipline problems should go to the C.D.C. All of the 4 teachers in schools with supportive services who had made discipline referrals said that they did so after becoming convinced that other individuals on the staff were unable to handle the discipline problem. In one case, referral was made to the C.D.C. for discipline after the school psychologist had recommended removal from the school (according to the teacher).

There was, again, no formal feedback to the teachers, and again teachers did not list this lack of feedback as a problem. Eleven teachers said they knew what the C.D.C. did with the students who were sent to him, while 13 gave answers indicating uncertainty such as: "I think she made him write a punishment--I really don't know', "I really didn't care what he did with him; he was out of class for a while at least--It was Heaven", "I think she tried to talk to him", "She talked to his parents, I think--I really don't know."

Given the fact that a large number of teachers made discipline referrals, it is noteworthy that, as the student interviews suggest, most students did not preceive the C.D.C. as a disciplinarian, and most of the C.D.C. techniques were not punishment techniques, as reported by students.

Observation in two schools is particularly worth reporting here. In one, careful attempts had been made, reportedly, to separate the role of disciplinarian from the role of the C.D.C., sending students

to whichever service was desired. In that school, only 4 students reported that they had been sent for discipline, while 3 teachers said that students were sent for discipline. Eight students reported receiving stern reprimands, but all students said they liked the C.B.C. and reported fair treatment. In another school, every teacher interviewed reported that students had been sent for discipline, and 17 of 20 students reported that they had received one kind of punishment or another, while 12 of the students said the C.B.C. in this situation was very unfair and reported that they did not like the consultant. Apparently, whether the two roles are separated will play a large part in student perceptions of the C.B.C.

3. Behavior Modification - It is difficult to clearly distinguish between discipline, as it was previously defined, and behavior modification. Broadly speaking, behavior modification is here taken to mean a way of remediating a problem other than through the use of force or a less desirable alternative. Teachers did not generally say that a given student was sent for behavior modification. The desire for modification rather than for punishment was inferred from phrases "I thought the C.B.C. might be able to help him", "He seemed to need someone else to discuss his behavior with him", "I thought that ---, (the C.B.C.), might be able to find out what was bothering him", "I suggested that he (the C.B.C.) might be able to find out his problems better than I could." There were 12 teachers who made comments similar to these, though it must be remembered that a C.B.C. might pursue behavior modification when punishment had been the teacher's purpose in sending the child. The 12 teachers who had

specifically requested behavior modification procedures reported generally that the C.B.C. had done a great deal for the child, but only 3 were willing to state that considerable behavior modification had occurred. (In view of the difficulty in changing behavior, it is doubtful that even the 3 cases mentioned were primarily a result of the C.B.C., since there are many obvious variables intervening between any supportive pupil-personnel service and the individual, few of which the supportive person can control.)

Again, there were no formal channels for feedback. However, the teachers in the group being discussed here seemed to have a fair idea of the general approach used by the C.B.C. Approaches listed included agency referral, parent conferences, pupil conferences, work arranged with the school psychologist, self-recording techniques developed for the pupil, observation techniques suggested to the teacher, rewards external to the situation, and classroom arrangements designed to help the child cope with his environment--most notably an isolation booth. It is not necessary to argue for the efficacy of such practices; it is the effort to modify behavior systematically which is at issue here. Eleven of the 12 teachers were firm in their conviction that few or none of the attempts at behavior modification reported would have occurred in the absence of the C.B.C.

In an effort to assess the quality of such attempts at behavior modification relative to the total school situation, teachers who were interviewed were encouraged to discuss the ways in which they disciplined students or tried to modify behavior. The following list of techniques was compiled: "Send him to the principal who

yells at him or makes him sit in the office", "Make him sit outside the door", "Sent him to sit in the nurse's office", "Make him stand up and read all period", "Give him a composition" or "Make him write a punishment"--nine teachers,"Make him write a sentence five hundred times", "Make him write on the board", "They stay after school", "I call their parents", "Don't let them go to lunch", "talk with them after school or during lunch about their problems", "send them to the guidance counsellor",--six teachers, "Make them stay after school and help me", "try to make them feel foolish."

One quotation from an interview will demonstrate the teacher sophistication regarding behavior management:

> I had one who came in yesterday--I called the parent last night--with a pair of dirth jeans--and I sez--and filthy. So I asked him where his trousers were--and--you should have seen the jeans. He'll be down here--He'll be down here--He couldn't find his pants. I said, "What do you mean you couldn't find your pants"--no I used the work "trousers"--and he said "I couldn't find them. Looked all over the house--couldn't fine 'em." So last night I called his home and I told his father that I expected to see him with a pair of trousers on today. School pants. And I said "If you wouldn't mind, I certainly would appreciate you giving that child a bath. He stunk. And was so dirty you would not have believed it. Sits right in front of me. Father sounds very intelligent. And is he lippy.

When this teacher was asked to discuss the ways in which she handled her discipline problems, she continued:

> It's individual--Now there are some individuals--I can reprimand them, I can hurt their feelings by saying something in front of the group,--and they will change for me. There are others that I could, (shall I use the word "ream out"), and it doesn't mean a thing. And then of course there are others all I have to say is "Well, I'll call your parents," and they settle right down. Then there are those could care less what I did.

The dialogue reported here (more properly a monologue at that point), was only a more vociferous example of a myriad of similar comments recorded during these interviews and heard at times by most teachers during the course of conversations about behavior which generate more heat than light.

There were in the group interviewed, however, teachers with clearly thought through concepts of behavior and ways to bring about its modification. Twelve of these teachers said, in one way or another, that the pressure of their jobs and other responsibilities prevented them from doing an effective job at helping a student with a behavioral problem, particularly with helping a student to obtain agency referrals. In fact, in two schools teachers expressed fear of suggesting to the principal that an agency should be contacted regarding a student or that parental cooperation should be sought for such an agency referral.

In summary, though behavior modification involved, apparently, less of significance for the teachers referring, that behavioral modification attempts which did occur were on a fairly high and systematic level as compared to the existing climate in the schools surveyed.

4. Behavior Consultant - There are at least 2 ways in which teachers perceived of the C.B.C.s as serving as behavior consultants. In one school, the C.B.C. worked directly with groups of first year teachers to assist them in behavioral management. Second, teachers in all of the schools (34 teachers in all), reported that they had been given help in the management of a particular child in the classroom situation.

Strong evidence emerged that small groups of teachers could use a consultant in behavior management. For example, only 3 teachers of the 50 interviewed stated that withdrawal was a serious behavioral problem. Further, several of the first year teachers interviewed (5 out of 7) said that they were seriously concerned about their management of behavioral problems during their first few months of teaching. However, no adequate techniques seem to have been used to determine the nature of the aid these teachers needed. Thus, in the school where such work was done, 3 meetings were held at which first year teachers were required to attend. Additional meetings were held after the first-year teachers "voted" at the third meeting that the meetings were useful and should be continued. Further, bulletins were distributed to this same group of teachers, and one of the first-year teachers interviewed maintained that she had read most of them.

Regarding individual aid to teachers, the help seems to have taken many forms, depending upon the school being considered. The means listed by teachers were: "Advice about methods", "Standing outside my classroom door so that it would quiet down", "She came to visit my class a few times to point out the behavior problems I didn't notice", "We were given a list of kids who were acting up in other classes", "She came into my class and gave me some suggestions after", "Gave me a list of problems teachers had last year", "Told me about some of the learning problems of a brain damaged child", "Talked to me and told me that others had the same problems."

The list presented contains some clearly undesirable actions.

However, it is important to keep two things in mind. First, this is only the teacher perception of what happened. Second, even if the perceptions are correct, some of the procedures are probably quite sound--hopefully experimentation and experience, tempered by forgiveness, might develop this area of service to teachers into a profitable one.

5. Resource Person - Nine instances were reported of illustrations of the use of C.B.C.s as resource persons. On 4 occasions, the C.B.C. was used because of special knowledge acquired from his training to fill his role. In the other cases, the C.B.C. was used because he possessed a skill which the teacher needed and because he was more available because of his flexible schedule than were others with a similar skill. Since this function was relatively extraneous to the role of the C.B.C., it will not be discussed at length. However, this tapping of personnel with special skills ought probably to be occurring more often than it has in the past; therefore, the importance of the activity should not be under-valued.

6. Extra Duties - One of the most constantly occurring teacher recommendations--13 teachers but from only two schools--was that the C.B.C. was not available enough of the time, primarily because he was given so many extra duties. As teachers recounted them, these duties included cafeteria supervision, hall supervision, and substitute teaching.

Teachers seemed to feel that the C.B.C. was of most value when he was present regularly. Thus, 8 teachers registered the opinion that a C.B.C. should function in only one building or school situation.

There was even complaint by some regarding the absence of the C.D.C. on Tuesday, during which day the training program for the year was conducted.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The study supports these conclusions:

1. Child Behavior Consultants had a better than average technique for dealing with children manifesting behavior problems, were in a better position to implement that understanding, and had opportunities for trying different approaches to fit the individual child.
2. Test evidence suggests that C.D.C.s worked with children who had problems in personality adjustment, even though teachers sometimes showed little understanding of the seriousness of some behavioral tendencies (e.g., withdrawal).
3. The role of the C.D.C. in each school was determined by the needs of that school, but the determination of the role to be filled was not always based upon the professional abilities of the C.D.C.
4. Thus, the C.D.C. frequently performed tasks beneath and above those which should have been expected; on one had, he was asked to perform functions beyond those of a psychologist; on the other hand, he was asked to substitute teach, police corridors, etc.

5. C.B.C.s were most effective in their relationships with children, and considerably less effective in parental relations, teacher education, and agency work; however, certain individual C.B.C.s were outstanding in each of the last three areas.
6. Because the C.B.C.s were present, more attention was paid to individual children and their individual problems than is often possible in the school setting.
7. In order to be fully evaluated, a program such as the one described here should run for more than one year--perferably at least three years, minimum.
8. With appropriate pre- and post-test data, accurate records, and careful design, such a program should yield valuable research data.

Although the recommendations presented here refer specifically to this program, they are probably applicable to other programs which might be initiated under Federal sponsorship.

1. The precise responsibilities of C.B.C.s should be spelled out in advance with the school officers to be directly concerned.
2. The C.B.C. should be ultimately responsible to only one individual.
3. Although there is danger that record-keeping can become an end rather than a means, careful consideration should be given to uniform records, particularly with reference to the ends which such records might serve.
4. Tutorial work with congenitally slow learners should be avoided.

5. Careful delineation should be made between the responsibilities of the C.D.C. and the proper responsibilities of other personnel--teacher, psychologist, nurse, guidance counselor, teacher supervisor, assistant principal.
6. A C.D.C. should function in only one building.
7. A C.D.C. should be available during the entire school day.
8. A C.D.C. should be equipped with all necessary apparatus for carrying out the job efficiently--an office removed from that of the principal, an outside telephone, adequate resource materials, freedom of movement, authority to consult with agencies and parents.
9. Theoretical concepts should be implemented only after a careful consideration of those concepts in the light of philosophy, objectives, and the local situation.
10. Evaluation procedures should be established in detail prior to project implementation.

CHAPTER IV

Severity of Personality Problems

Introduction: Chapters II and III represent the Child Behavior Consultant as involved in working with children having serious personality problems. However, evidence tended to indicate that teachers were referring students more with regard to classroom convenience than to personality adjustment. In this chapter, an attempt to determine whether personality problems were actually referred is presented.

It appears, from reading the notes and the journal articles assigned to the C.B.C.s in their training program, that the work of the C.B.C. involved child behavior that could be termed "abnormal." At the conslusion of the training course, each C.B.C. presented, in writing, a brief statement of what functions he expected to fulfill in his school while employed as a C.B.C. From these reports, it seems the C.B.C.s apparently thought they would devote a significant portion of their working time to children with various types of behavior "deviations."

Apparently the C.B.C.s were trained, and did expect to work with children with many types of deviant behavior. Therefore, some measure of behavior pathology would be a useful instrument in this evaluation. The children the C.B.C. worked with could be compared to children with whom the C.B.C. never had contact in an attempt to determine if the C.B.C. was actually working with "deviant" students, as he was trained and expected to do. The same personality measure could be used to compare the children with whom the C.B.C. considered

himself successful to those with whom he was less successful in a search for personality differences. The C.D.C.s judgement of the degree of a child's abnormality could be compared with the assessment of the degree of abnormality as indicated by the personality test in order to see if the C.D.C. actually was a reliable judge of behavior pathology. This comparison could, if both the test and the C.D.C. were similar in their estimations of the degree of pathology, would give empirical support to the C.D.C.s' statements regarding child pathology and its change.

Limitation: In order for this section of the evaluation to be valid, whatever personality measure was chosen should have been administered to all the referrals before they had any contact with the C.D.C. Then one-half of these students should have been randomly selected for work with the C.D.C., while the other referrals had no contact with the C.D.C. If this procedure was followed, any changes in the test scores of the students after they had worked with the C.D.C. (that were not found in the test scores of the other children) could be attributed to the work with the C.D.C.

However, when this program went into effect, no provision was made for the necessary preliminary administration of the personality test. Consequently, no causal inferences can be made to explain any personality differences shown on the final test between children with whom the C.D.C. worked and those with whom he did not; or between children with whom the C.D.C. thought he was successful and those with whom he thought he was not. Any differences found in the final testing might have been present at the begining of the program

and completely unrelated to the child's work with the C.B.C.

The Test: The students the C.B.C. worked with ranged in educational level from first grade to grade twelve. Consequently very few measures of personality that could be used in this evaluation were found. From the several choices available, the California Test of Personality was selected. This test measures the child's total adjustment, and is subdivided into personal adjustment (which is further subdivided into self-reliance, sense of personal worth, sense of personal freedom, feeling of belonging, withdrawing tendencies, and nervous symptoms) and into social adjustment (which is further subdivided into social standards, social skills, anti-social tendencies, family relations, school relations, and community relations). The definition of each scale that is provided with the test is given in the Appendix to this chapter.

Procedures: In order to randomly select students for testing, each C.B.C. was requested to rate each child along a continuum based upon success. Success was defined as any combination of improved functioning in the school situation, improved adjustment to the school situation, or a reduction in the child's emotional problems. The C.B.C. was instructed to divide the continuum into seven sections, and was not permitted to place more than 15% of the students with whom he worked in any single category.

Ten students were randomly selected from groups 2 and 3 (group 1 was the most successful; group 7 was the most unsuccessful) for comparison with a random sample of 10 children from groups 5 and 6. The most successful group (group 1) and the most unsuccessful group

(group 7) were omitted because the investigator felt that these students would present an extreme rather than a typical example of the type of child the C.B.C. worked with. No students who visited the C.B.C. less than 5 times during the school year were considered in this selection.

A ten-student control group was also randomly selected using the class lists of the teachers of the students who had been selected as described above. Classes were randomly selected from the group of these class lists, then one child (who had never worked with the C.B.C.) was picked randomly for each of these classes until the ten control students had all been chosen.

In one of the schools where the tests were given the selection of the control group was not random, and therefore could not be considered with the other results.

The test has several forms for use with subjects of different ages. The primary and elementary forms were used for these children.

Findings: A t-test was used to make all the comparisons between the various groups. The tested children with whom the C.B.C.s worked in two primary schools scored significantly lower on the total adjustment scale than the control groups ($t=3.33$; $p=.01$). When subdivided into personal and social adjustment, the controls scored significantly higher on personal adjustment than the students the C.B.C. worked with ($t=4.00$; $p=.01$), but on the social adjustment scale the score of the controls was not significantly higher than the C.B.C.'s students ($t=1.38$). When the six components of the personal adjustment scale were considered individually, a significant difference between the

two groups of students was found in sense of personal worth (t=2.75; p=.02), feeling of belonging (t=2.44; p=.05), withdrawing tendencies (t=3.24; p=.01), and nervous symptoms (t=2.54; p=.02). In all cases the control groups were better adjusted than the other groups, but the differences in self-reliance and sense of personal freedom were not significant. The means of each group and the values of t with the levels of confidence at which they are significant are presented in Table 1:

Table 1

Comparisons Using t-Test Between Students
The C.B.C. Worked With and the Controls

Test Section	t	p
Primary Test		
Total Adjustment	3.33	.01
Social Adjustment	1.38	n.s.
Personal Adjustment	4.00	.01
sense of personal worth	2.75	.02
feeling of belonging	2.44	.05
withdrawing tendencies	3.24	.01
nervous symptoms	2.54	.02
self-reliance	n.s.	
sense of personal freedom	n.s.	
Elementary Test		
Total Adjustment	1.67	.10
Social Adjustment	1.54	n.s.
Personal Adjustment	1.51	n.s.

When the control groups in the elementary schools were compared with all the C.D.C.'s students in the same three schools, the control group tended to be better adjusted, in fact t=1.67 (which is weakly significant at the .10 level of confidence). The total adjustment of the elementary children was subdivided into the two components (personal and social adjustment) and the control groups were compared with all the C.D.C.'s students. Although the trends showed better adjustment in the control group, neigher of the differences between the groups was significant (t=1.51 on personal adjustment, and t=1.54 on social adjustment).

The next step was to compare the groups rated by the C.D.C. as successful (2 and 3) to the less successful groups (5 and 6). In the elementary schools, the comparison of groups 2 and 3 with groups 5 and 6 on total adjustment yielded a value for t of .63, far from significant. In the primary schools, t was equal to .60, again not significant. Since these values of t were of such a small magnitude, no further t-tests were executed.

Conclusions - The results of the personality test seem to lead to two conclusions. First: from the highly significant value of t found in the primary tests and from the pronounced trend in the elementary tests, it appears that the C.D.C. was working, at the end of the school year, with children who were more maladjusted than average. It appears that whoever referred these children did select the ones who actually did need improvement in their adjustment. There is the possibility, however, that during the course of the year these children became maladjusted, even though they were very well adjusted at the beginning

of the year. Without the preliminary test in the fall, this possibility can not be entirely eliminated, nor can any statement be made regarding improvement in the children the C.D.C. worked with. The second major conclusion is that the adjustment of the children with whom the C.D.C. thought he was successful was not, at the end of the school year, substantially better than the adjustment of the students with whom the C.D.C. thought he was less successful. Here again, a test in September might have revealed significant differences which disappeared during the school year; for instance, the students judged as the lesser successes might have improved more than the more successful students, obliterating early adjustment differences.

Appendix

Definitations of the Components of the California Test of Personality

The following components are not names for so-called general traits. They are, rather, names for groupings of more or less specific tendencies to feel, think, and act.

Personal Adjustment

1A. Self-Reliance - An individual may be said to be self-reliant when his overt actions indicate that he can do things independently of others, depend upon himself in various situations, and direct his own activities. The self-reliant person is also characteristically stable emotionally, and responsible in his behavior.

1B. Sense of Personal Worth - An individual possesses a sense of being worthy when he feels he is well regarded by others, when he feels that others have faith in his future success, and when he believes that he has average or better than average ability. To feel worthy means to feel capable and reasonably attractive.

1C. Sense of Personal Freedom - An individual enjoys a sense of freedom when he is permitted to have a reasonable share in the determination of his conduct and in setting the general policies that shall govern his life. Desirable freedom includes permission to choose one's own friends and to have at least a little spending money.

1D. Feeling of Belonging - An individual feels that he belongs when he enjoys the love of his family, the well-wishes of good friends, and a cordial relationship with people in general. Such a person

will as a rule get along well with his teachers or employers and usually feels proud of his school or place of business.

1E. Withdrawing Tendencies - The individual who is said to withdraw is the one who substitutes the joys of a fantasy world for actual successes in real life. Such a person is characteristically sensitive, lonely, and given to self-concern. Normal adjustment is characterized by reasonable freedom from these tendencies.

1F. Nervous Symptoms - The individual who is classified as having nervous symptoms is the one who suffers from one or more of a variety of physical symptoms such as loss of appetite, frequent eye strain, inability to sleep, or a tendency to be chronically tired. People of this kind may be exhibiting physical expressions of emotional conflicts.

Social Adjustment

2A. Social Standards - The individual who recognizes desirable social standards is the one who has come to understand the rights of others and who appreciates the necessity of subordinating certain desires to the needs of the group. Such an individual understands what is regarded as being right or wrong.

2B. Social Skills - An individual may be said to be socially skillful or effective when he shows a liking for people, when he inconveniences himself to be of assistance to them, and when he is diplomatic in his dealings with both friends and strangers. The socially skillful person subordinates his or her egoistic tendencies in favor of interest in the problems and activities of his associates.

2C. Anti-Social Tendencies - An individual would normally be regarded as anti-social when he is given to bullying, frequent quarreling, disobedience, and destructiveness to property. The anti-social person is the one who endeavors to get his satisfaction in ways that are damaging and unfair to others. Normal adjustment is characterized by reasonable freedom from these tendencies.

2D. Family Relations - The individual who exhibits desirable family relationships is the one who feels that he is loved and well-treated at home, and who has a sense of security and self-respect in connection with the various members of his family. Superior family relations also include parental control that is neither too strict nor too lenient.

2E. School Relations - The student who is satisfactorily adjusted to his school is the one who feels that his teachers like him, who enjoys being with other students, and who finds the school work adapted to his level of interest and maturity. Good school relations involve the feeling on the part of the student that he counts for something in the life of the institution.

2F. Community Relations - The individual who may be said to be making good adjustments in his community is the one who mingles happily with his neighbors, who takes pride in community improvements, and who is tolerant in dealing with both strangers and foreigners. Satisfactory community relations include as well the disposition to be respectful of laws and of regulations pertaining to the general welfare.

CHAPTER V

Self-Perceptions of the Behavior Consultants

Introduction: Early in the evaluation the C.B.C.s completed a questionaire on which they rated each child on how successful they felt they had been in working with him. Success was defined as any combination of improved functioning in the school situation, improved adjustment to the school situation, or a reduction in the child's emotional problems. The C.B.C.s rated each child along a 7-category success continuum - they were permitted to place no more than 15% of the children they worked with in any of the categories. In addition, the questionaire obtained information regarding the C.B.C.'s functions, the number of students he worked with, etc.

Time Distribution: One of the major questions required the C.B.C.s to list the most important aspects of their jobs and the percentage of their working time that was devoted to each of these activities. The presentation of the different activities and the time spent in each is extremely difficult because the functions and descriptions of them found in the questionaire varied greatly. The only way to cope with this problem and still present an adequate picture of the varied activities of the C.B.C.s and the proportion of the time spent in each was to total the percentages of time the C.B.C.s spent on each function and present these totals in relation to the total working time of the C.B.C.s. In the following table, the percentages of time each C.B.C. devoted to a particular function are totaled. When reading this table, one must constantly keep in

mind that these percentages are of the total working time of the 8 C.D.C.s, which is 805 rather than 800 because one C.D.C. accounted for 105% of the working time.

The Percentage of Total C.D.C. Working on Various Functions

Tutoring	404%
Behavior Modification, Guidance, Counseling	219%
Consultant (with parent, teacher, administration, etc.)	123%
*Crisis Intervention	14%
*Resource and Experimental	14%
*Group Guidance	14%
*Teaching Demonstrations	14%
*Teaching	3%

* one C.D.C. reported serving these functions

(note: these percentages give a total of 805% because one C.D.C. accounted for 105% of working time)

Work Load: As the table shows, the C.D.C.s work covered 3 major areas; tutoring, behavior modification, and consultation with teachers, parents, administration, etc. The most important task of the C.D.C.s seems to have been tutoring.

This initial questionaire also collected information that could be expressed numerically to give added perspective to the work of the C.D.C. Each of the following figures is the mean from the answers of the C.D.C.s to the particular question. The mean number

of children the C.D.C.s worked with 88.0--the mean number of regular visitors was 48.9. The length of these consultations was 31.9 minutes and the students met with the C.D.C. a mean of 17.5 times. Although the C.D.C.s did work with about 88 children, the mean number of students whose parents also discussed the child's problem with the C.D.C. was only 14.6 - the maximum number of discussions the C.D.C.s reported yielded a mean of 2.6 talks with parents, while the average number of talks reported by the C.D.C.s produced a mean of 1.3 discussions.

The majority of the referrals were by the teacher - in fact 74.1% were teacher referrals - the mean percentage of self-referrals was 8.4% and the mean of all other types of referrals was 19.4% (due to one figure of 80% - all the other percentages were much smaller). Table 2 is a concise presentation of these means and the range of the figures the C.D.C.s reported.

Means and Ranges of the Figures on Student and Parent Involvement as Reported by the C.D.C.

	mean	range
number of children who saw C.D.C.	88.0	1-120
number of regular visitors of C.D.C.	48.9	32-104
length of consultation	31.9 min.	25-45 min.
number of visits by each child	17.5	1-200
parent-C.D.C. discussions	14.6	3-28
maximum number of parent-C.D.C. discussions	2.6	1-4
average number of parent-C.D.C. discussions	1.3	1-2
percent of teacher referrals	74.1%	5-96%
percent of self-referrals	8.4%	2-25%
percent of other types of referrals	19.4%	0-80%

Absolute and Relative Judgements of Success: Approximately 2 months later, as the involvement of the C.B.C.s in the program was nearing an end, an alphabetical list of all the students the C.B.C.s had rated on the earlier questionaire was returned to the C.B.C. On this latter list, the C.B.C. was asked to again rate his success with each child. Seven rating categories were available on this questionaire: category 1 was very successful; #2 was successful; #3 - slightly successful; #4 - no change; #5 - slightly unsuccessful; #6 - unsuccessful; and #7 - very unsuccessful. However, in this questionaire the rating was not relative but absolute; the C.B.C.s were allowed to group as many students as they wished in any single category.

When permitted to do this, the C.B.C.s tended to place fewer students in groups 1,4,5,6,7 and to concentrate the students in groups 2 and 3. Apparently the C.B.C.s thought, or at least professed to believe, that they experienced some degree of success in the large majority of cases, and were unsuccessful with very few students. Table 4 shows the number of students placed in each category in both the relative and the absolute ratings. These data are based on the replies of only 5 C.B.C.s.

Number of Children Rated in Each Category of Success on Both Questionaires

Category	Questionaire #1	Questionaire #2
1 (most successful)	42	29
2	47	87
3	46	128
4 (neutral)	46	38
5	42	12
6	40	6
7 (most unsuccessful)	40	3

It appears that the C.B.C.s thought they were successful or mildly successful with approximately 70% of the children they had worked with. If this was a completely unequivocal finding, the C.B.C.s success in their schools would be excellent. However, many factors must be considered before accepting this finding as conclusive. This rating of success in only that of one of the group of people working with these children, and it is by the person who is the most ego-involved in the project and therefore the one most threatened by admission of failure on this evaluation. This does not mean that the C.B.C.s necessarily were purposely, consciously overrating their success with the children: they may have been consciously accurate but caused to overrate their success by subconscious motives. Possibly each C.B.C. was basing his rating of success upon some other criterion that the one provided by the investigator; maybe by utilizing his private definition of success, the C.B.C. was able to find areas in which he was highly successful and which were used as the basis for his rating. The interviews with the teachers and the children indicated that they too thought the C.B.C. somewhat successful; however, this could be attributed to the demand characteristics of the interview. To adequately measure success, some pre and post test measures should have been made - the lack of the measure when the program was iniated prevents this evaluation from making a judgement of C.B.C. success that could be considered totally valid.

Functions Performed: The results of another C.B.C. questionaire are closely related to the above results. On this questionaire, the C.B.C.s were given a list of functions, derived from the written

expectations of the C.B.C.s after their training. They were asked to rate how successful they felt they had been in fulfilling these various functions. In order to rate their success, a 5-category rating scale was provided with this third questionaire: category 1 was used if the C.B.C.s thought they were very successful in serving that function or in attaining that goal; category 2 if they felt they were mildly successful; category 3 if mildly unsuccessful; category 4 if very unsuccessful; and category 5 if they thought this item was irrelevant to their functioning. The C.B.C.s were also asked to rate the group's success, if they felt they could do so, using the same scale.

The trends that were visible in this questionaire were very similar to those found in the second questionaire. Table 4 presents the number of responses in each category by all the C.B.C.s in rating their own success, and the number of responses in each category by the three C.B.C.s who rated the group's success.

Number Of Responses on Questionaire 3 Within Each Category of Success

very successful	mildly	mildly unsuccessful	very	irrelevant	blank
1	2	3	4	5	
Self-Rating					
298	262	26	1	87	35
Group Rating (by only 3 C.B.C.s)					
92	128	11	0	22	5

As the table shows, the C.B.C.s considered themselves successful to some degree in an extremely large majority of the functions.

The possibility arises that, for one of several feasible reasons, the C.B.C.s were responding to all the functions with a rating of success. In order to test for this possibility, a list of practices that would, given the C.B.C.s' six weeks of training and the orientation of this training, be considered rather poor was compiled. Appendix A of this chapter lists these functions and presents a brief explanation of why they would be considered poor, at least in this context. The number of C.B.C. responses in each category to these 8 poor functions can be found in Table 5.

Number of Responses in Each Category of Success to the Poor Functions on Questionaire #3

poor practice no.	Rating Categories: very successful 1	mildly successful 2	very unsuccessful 3	mildly unsuccessful 4	irrelevant 5
I.	2	2	1		3
II.	1	2			5
III.	1	4			3
IV.	3	3			2
V.	1		2		5
VI.	2	4			2
VII.		2			6
VIII.		4			4
Totals:	10	21	3		30

The correct response here would have been category 5, the incorrect response categories 1 or 2. Categories 3 and 4 are marginal, but since only 3 responses were in these categories, they can be disregarded without distorting the results. Table 5 shows that more responses were incorrect (categories 1 and 2) than were correct (category 5). This seems unusual since some of the practices were exactly opposite the recommended functions of the program, and others were contrary to principles learned in relatively basic psychology courses or textbooks.

In addition, this list of functions included 5 that were repeated, either verbatim or with rewording that left the meaning intact. Appendix B of this chapter presents the 5 functions; the first (a) is the original presentation of the practice and the second (b) is the wording of the alternate form of the function. These practices were used in an attempt to determine if the C.B.C.s were concentrating on the rating task or if they were answering without thorough consideration of the practice and its implications.

Table 6 gives the number of responses that were unchanged on the second presentation of the function, the number that were completely changed, the number of responses that were partially changed (this occurred when one of the C.B.C.s who rated the group as well as himself changed on rating or the repitition of the function, but left the other rating identical to the original), and the number of functions to which the C.B.C. responded to only one of the pair.

Types of Responses to a Second Presentation of a Function

function number	responded to only 1 of 2 presentations	same rating on both presentations	changed rating on second presentation	changed 1 of the 2 ratings on second presentation
1	1	4	3	
2	1	4	2	1
3		3	4	1
4		4	3	1
5		6	1	1
Totals:	2	21	13	4

From the totals within each group, it can be seen that 17 responses were altered, at least partially, while 21 responses were not changed. It appears that the C.B.C.s did not consistently use the same rating on the second presentation of the function. In fact, on the one practice that was repeated verbatim, exactly 50% of the responses on the second presentation differed from the response on the first presentation.

It seems, from the results of the poor practice section and the section rephrasing the same function, that the C.B.C.s were not carefully considering each function, but were rating the majority of the practices as belonging to category 1 or 2. If the C.B.C.s were being meticulous in answering the questions, it seems unlikely that very many would be rated differently the second time they were presented (especially when the second presentation was varbatim repitition) and that the C.B.C.s would have discovered more than 50% of the

poor practices, some of which were directly contrary to the methods and goals of the program. It would be impossible to speculate with any accuracy which of the many possible reasons caused the C.B.C.s to answer in this manner. Perhaps they felt successful, but did not know specifically why and consequently rated most of the practices favorably. Maybe the C.B.C.s were threatened by admission of failure and wished to make themselves appear in the best possible light. Of course, the C.B.C.s might have been completely accurate, or at least believed they were, in their assesment of their success. Maybe compelling time demands forced the C.B.C.s to rate the practices hurriedly, without time to carefully consider each function.

Although this seems the most parsimonious, reasonable explanation of the results, it is not the only one possible. For instance; the C.B.C.s might not have preceived the meaning the investigator did in some function, and therefore did not realize the poor practices actually were poor or that the first and second presentations of some function meant the same thing. Possibly the poor practices, which necessarily entail a value judgement on the part of the investigator, were not poor or that the second meaning of a repeated function was not exactly equivalent to the first. Many of these alternative explanations can be found, but the one first mentioned does seem the most logical.

Perception of Relationships: The third questionaire was used also to compile the stated opinions of the C.B.C. regarding areas such as the student-C.B.C. relationship, the C.B.C.'s relationship to the school, etc., and will be briefly presented here.

All the C.D.C.s felt the summer training course was beneficial, but only 4 thought it essential to the role they held during the school year - 2 said it was not essential, 1 stated it was helpful, and the other left the space blank. Some of the common reasons cited as examples of ways in which the summer training helped were: it aided in more thoroughly understanding the child; it provided a theoretical background for the C.D.C.'s work; it gave needed methods of behavior modification; and it expanded the C.D.C.'s knowledge of outside resources. Five thought the fulfillment of the role did not differ from their expectations, 3 thought the execution of the role involved more referrals, more tutoring, or was better accepted than they had expected.

Two C.D.C.s did not think their role as a C.D.C. entailed a different type of interpersonal relationship with the students than that of their previous role as a teacher. The remainder of the consultants thought the C.D.C.'s role was less formal, more intimate, involved less emotion on their part, was more objective, was more empathetic, or gave them more time with students that did the role of a teacher. Five C.D.C.s thought they dealt with the child's basic problems, 1 thought only the child's classroom adjustment was involved, 1 thought he worked with both, and the answer of the other was unintelligible.

All the C.D.C.s felt that other faculty members did not feel threatened by referring children nor resented the C.D.C.'s position within the school. The C.D.C.s all agreed that the majority of the referrals were necessary and all but 1 reported that the teachers

did assume their part in the responsibility of altering student behavior. All felt the teachers were cooperative and 6 of the 8 believed that the administration had been cooperative.

All the C.D.C.s said they liked the majority of the children they worked with and all felt that few of the children's personalities were objectionable. Almost all the C.D.C.s thought the children perceived them as friendly, understanding, and trustworthy, but were almost equally divided in their opinions about whether the children perceived them as sympathetic or as a disciplinarian; a goal of the program was to not be perceived as a disciplinarian. Two C.D.C.s thought they were more successful with male students; the others thought there was no relation between sex and success. One C.D.C. believed he was more successful with older children and 2 thought they were more successful with younger students; the other C.D.C.s felt there were no differences in success between age groups. All thought the parental attitudes toward the C.D.C. were favorable.

Some of the major difficulties encountered by the various C.D.C.s in establishing their roles were the necessity to overcome negative teacher bias against themselves, the need to remain unprejudiced by teacher opinion, superficial involvement in too many areas with involvement in depth in none, incomplete understanding of the learning process and behavior, and convincing teachers to experiment with new methods. One fortunate individual reported that no problems were encountered in establishing the role of the C.D.C.

Conclusions: It appears from these questionaires, that the C.D.C.s considered themselves successful in their position as a

C.D.C., both in fulfilling the many functions listed on the questionaire and with many individual children. However, the findings with the poor and repeated functions suggest that the results of this questionaire must not be considered unequivocal.

Appendix A

Functions and Explanations for Their Poorness

I. present the causes of the children's problems to psychologists so they can move directly to treatment of the problem - - - poor because C.B.C.s not qualified to diagnosis the etiology of child pathology

II. avoid working with groups of children because of the lack of individual expression these groups allow - - - one of the original C.B.C. functions listed by the project director was "When appropriate, work in small groups during scheduled or unscheduled periods with problem children . . . ."

III. help problem children realize that their problems are unusual and realize the ways in which a C.B.C. can help them with these unusual problems - - - because of the danger to the child's self concept, no emphasis should be placed on how deviant or unusual he is

IV. give the child a sense of direction by providing early vocational guidance - - - the children that most of the C.B.C.s worked with were so young that their school program would remain unchanged whatever their vocational goals were

V. help children realize that many of their problems are the result of slightly abnormal parental behavior - - - the abnormality of the child or his close associates should be deemphasized

VI. show problem children how their own behavior has caused teachers to lose confidence in their ability to learn - - - the confidence, rather than the lack of it, of others in the students

life should be stressed because of the danger of the self-fulfilling prophecy

VII. help the teacher to realize that, by not sending problem children to special schools, she is seriously depriving the remainder of the class of learning opportunities - - - the emphasis of the C.D.C. training was on helping children work within their class without removal to a special school or class

VIII. assist children in realizing that the help of someone with special training, such as a C.D.C., is necessary if they hope to solve their problems - - - again here, the child's abnormality should be deemphasized because of the danger to the child's self-concept

Appendix D

The Two Wordings Used
For the Same Function

Function No.

1. a - find the cause of the child's problem

   b - diagnose the etiology of student problems

2. a - assist the faculty in becoming more competent in recognizing what behavior is symptomatic of problems in children

   b - help the faculty improve their ability to detect problem children

3. a - keep responsibilities regarding pupil behavior at least partly in the hands of the teacher

   b - prevent the teacher from completely turning the responsibility for the child's behavior over to the C.D.C.

4. a - develop atmosphere in meetings with teachers that makes the teacher feel freer to interchange information regarding student behavior

   b - (exactly the same wording as a)

5. a - help the child to feel free to discuss his behavior

   b - make the students feel free to talk about their behavior